

**REMARKS**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action issued on June 13, 2005. By this response, claims 21, 22 and 24 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-13 and 21-25 are now active for examination.

The Office Action dated June 13, 2005 rejected claims 1-13 and 21-25 under obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,972 ("the '972 patent"). Claims 21, 22 and 24 are objected to for formality reasons. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome and the objections are addressed in view of the amendment and/or remarks presented herein.

**The Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejection Is Traversed**

Claims 1-13 and 21-25 were rejected under obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-33 of U.S. Patent No. 6,839,972 ("the '972 patent"). The rejection is respectfully traversed because claims 1-13 and 21-25 of the instant application and claims 1-33 of the '972 patent are patentably distinct from each other.

Claims 1-13 and 21-25 of this application include descriptions related to a user interface indicating positions of the first sensing device and the second sensing device. For instance, as illustrated in Figure 3, needles 360A and 360B indicate respective positions of alignment cameras. This feature is unavailable in any of the claims of the '972 patent.

On the other hand, claims 1-343 of the '972 patent include features that are not available in claims 1-13 and 21-25 of this application, such as determining whether a testing target is within a specific sensing field; repositioning the sensing field of a sensing device until a testing target is within a specific sensing field; determining an operation mode; providing a visual

indication to indicate that a target fails to be within a specific viewing field; and continuously repositioning of a sensing device until a target properly appears in a specific viewing field.

Since claims 1-13 and 21-25 of the instant application include distinctive and non-obvious features that are not described in claims 1-33 of the '972 patent, and vice versa, claims 1-13 and 21-25 of the instant application and claims 1-33 of the '972 are patentably distinct from each other. Accordingly, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection based on claims 1-33 of the '972 patent is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-13 and 21-25 is respectfully requested.

**The Objections to Claims 21, 22 and 24 Are Addressed**

Claim 21 was objected to for including a typographical error. By this Response, the typographical error has been corrected. Claim 21 is now in proper form.

The Office Action objected to claims 22 and 24 by asserting that the description "position sensor" in claims 22 and 24 may be redundant to the first and second sensing devices in the measuring modules. Applicants respectfully disagree.

It is respectfully submitted that the position sensor and the first and the first and second sensing devices perform different functions. According to claims 22 and 24, as well as their respective base claims, a sensing device is provided in a measuring module to obtain positional data of a testing target relative to the sensing device. In contrast, a position sensor described in claims 22 and 24 is used to detect a position status of a sensing device, such as a rotation angle of the sensing device. The position status of the sensing device may be displayed on a user interface (see, for example, needles 360A and 360B in Figure 3 of the written description). Accordingly, the description related to the position sensor is not redundant to the first and second sensing devices.

The Office Action further objected to claims 22 and 24 by asserting that the relationships between the position sensor, the first and second sensing devices, and the first and second measuring modules are not clear. By this Response, claims 22 and 24 are amended to clarify the relationships between the position sensor, the measuring module and the sensing device. It is respectfully submitted that claims 22 and 24 are now in appropriate form.

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representatives listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen  
Registration No. 56,665

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:WC:apr  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: August 18, 2005**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**